



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/716,661	•	11/20/2003	Kimihiko Kajimoto	900-481 7439		
23117	7590	04/28/2005		EXAMINER		
NIXON & 1100 N GLE		RHYE, PC	· RACHUBA, MAURINA T			
8TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714				3723		

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		6	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/716,661	KAJIMOTO ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	M Rachuba	3723	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from t, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 N	ovember 2003.		
	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	esecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 8-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 8-11 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	·	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 November 2003</u> is/a			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	· "П		
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da		
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5)  Notice of Informal F 6)  Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/716,661 Page 2

Art Unit: 3723

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Grandia et al, 4,084,354, column 3, lines 34-39 or Hirano et al, 5,484,326, column 4, lines 48-63.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/716,661

Art Unit: 3723

5. Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grandia et al, 4,084,354, or Hirano et al, 5,484,326. Neither '354 nor 326 disclose the polished side faces of the silicon block having a surface roughness of 8 μm or less. Surface roughness is a result-effective variable of the type of abrasive used, the size of the abrasive, the starting surface roughness, the time the block is polished, etc. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided '354 or 326 with a surface roughness of 8 μm or less, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 315 (CCPA 1980).

### Conclusion

- 6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Other similar methods are cited of interest.
- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M Rachuba whose telephone number is (571) 272-4493. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 AM to 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail, can be reached on (571) 272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Rachuba
Primary Patent Examiner